



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that she might one day become 'the bully of the world,' and welcomed a convulsion that threatened to split the Union into two hostile halves. Others illogically sympathized with the South merely because it was the weaker side, or because they thought the Southern planters better men than the hard and astute traders of the North. The Palmerston Cabinet, with great wisdom, tried to steer a middle course and to avoid all interference. But when the Confederates held their own in arms, they thought themselves bound to recognize them as a belligerent power and to treat them as a nation" (p. 696). Comment upon this passage, with its curious travesty of Palmerston's position, is needless.

It is to be stated in conclusion that both these new histories of England are strong upon the military side and that they are both illustrated with several plans of famous battles. The distinguished authors have produced books which will hardly increase their reputation as historians, but which are nevertheless gallant attempts to meet the want which undoubtedly exists for a competent and scholarly history of England for the use of high schools and colleges.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

Feudal England: Historical Studies on the XIth and XIIth Centuries. By J. H. ROUND, M.A. (London: Swan Sonnen-schein and Co. 1895. Pp. xvi, 587.)

Most of the papers in this volume have appeared in recent years in the *English Historical Review* and other periodicals; they have been carefully revised, and much new matter has been added. This series of studies, covering the years 1050-1200, is called *Feudal England*, because some of them deal with the origins or early history of the feudal system. A title referring to Domesday Book would, perhaps, be more appropriate, for in the most important essays Domesday Book is carefully exploited; and the most valuable results of Mr. Round's researches are largely based on that great record or on kindred surveys. This volume will, in fact, give him a high rank among Domesday investigators; in his profound knowledge of its formulas and contents he stands without a peer. In *Feudal England*, as in *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, he displays consummate skill in the critical study of records, and uses the evidence thus obtained to check and supplement the chroniclers.

Mr. Round's minute investigations do not yield a mere mass of curious information; some of his deductions are of far-reaching importance. The most instructive papers are those on "Domesday Book" (pp. 3-146) and "The Introduction of Knight Service into England" (pp. 225-314). The second half of the volume is largely devoted to the errors of Professor Freeman, who is accused of viewing plain facts "through a mist of moots and witan" and of sinning against all the canons of historical learning. As regards the famous controversy concerning the palisade at the Battle of Hastings, no one, it seems, has ever called attention to the fact

that Mr. Round's criticism of Professor Freeman's views was anticipated, to a certain extent at least, by G. Koehler in his *Entwicklung des Kriegswesens* (1886), with which work Mr. Round does not seem to be acquainted.

Many of Mr. Round's new conclusions are derived from a careful comparison of Domesday Book with the "Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis," which is a copy of the original returns of the Domesday jurors and deals with the holders of lands in Cambridgeshire. He confirms the view that the hide, when used as a measure of area in Domesday, contains 120 acres; and he propounds the new theory that the assessment of land in Domesday is based on the five-hide unit among the Anglo-Saxons in the South, and on the six-carucate unit among the Danes in the North. Most of the southern manors are assessed in Domesday as of five hides or some multiple of five hides, and our author holds that this assessment bore no ratio to area or to value in the vill or the manor; in other words, the hide, in this system of taxation, was not an areal measure but a term of assessment. The territorial hundred, as a whole, was assessed for some multiple of the five-hide unit, and the representatives of the hundred saw that each vill or manor was debited with a correct share of the liability. The part played in the hidated portions of England by the five-hide unit is played in the Danish districts by a unit of six caruces. This rule applies not to the Danelaw, not to "the district which the Danes *conquered*, but the district which the Danes *settled*, the district of 'the Five Boroughs'" (p. 71). Mr. Round's statement regarding this matter is somewhat misleading, for he also includes Yorkshire in the carcated district, and Yorkshire was not dependent on "the Five Boroughs."

The method adopted by the Witan to apportion the Danegeld is explained as follows:—

"Their only possible resource, we might hold, would be to apportion it in round sums among the contributory shires. Proceeding on precisely the same lines, the county court, in its turn, would distribute the *quota* of the shire among its constituent Hundreds, and the Hundred court would then assign to each Vill its share. As the Vills were represented in the Hundred court, and the Hundreds in the Shire court, the just apportionment of the Shire's *quota* would be thus practically secured" (p. 92).

The assertion that the vills were represented in the hundred court and the hundreds in the shire court, though it may be true, is too categorical; the evidence on which this statement is commonly based is certainly very meagre. Moreover, in dealing with the same general subject (p. 97), Mr. Round, like most writers, accepts Bishop Stubbs' dictum that the territorial hundred is first mentioned in England in Edgar's laws; it is, however, clearly mentioned in Edmund's laws, III. c. 2.

Among other matters discussed in connection with Domesday Book, those of special interest are the composition of the juries by whom the returns were made, the origin of the "Inquisitio Eliensis," and the striking differences between the two volumes formed from the Domesday

returns. Mr. Round sees no proof that Domesday Book was compiled in 1086; because the survey was made in 1086, it has been hastily concluded that Domesday Book was completed in that year. He often points out errors in this peerless record; it is not to him the sacrosanct repository of facts that it was to Pepys, who wrote to a friend for information as to what it contained "concerning the sea and the dominion thereof." He also calls attention to the unsound methods employed by modern investigators in studying that great record.

In the essay on knight service our author takes a firm stand against what he calls "the anticataclysmic tendencies of modern thought," or "the theory of gradual development and growth." He rejects the view that military tenures and the feudal system were introduced into England during the reign of William Rufus through the influence of Ranulf Flambard. He believes that just as Henry II. granted out the provinces of Ireland to be held as fiefs by the service of a round number of knights, so William the Conqueror granted out the fiefs he formed in England, and that these fiefs were wholly new creations constructed from the scattered fragments of Anglo-Saxon estates. Thus the Conqueror divided England into military fees and systematically introduced feudal tenures into England. The quotas of knight service were not estimated on the basis of the number of five-hide units contained in the fief, but were determined arbitrarily by the king. The number of differing fiefs assessed at precisely the same amount of knight service proves that the assessment was wholly arbitrary. The knight's fee, held by an undertenant, consisted normally of an estate worth £20 a year, and was not based on the five hides of the Anglo-Saxon system. The whole number of knights' fees for which service was due to the crown did not exceed five thousand.

In dealing with knight service, our author throws much light on the early history of scutage; he proves that it existed at least as early as Henry I.'s reign, and that the amount of scutage was determined by the estimated cost of substitutes hired to perform the vassal's military service. "Thus the only change involved [by the introduction of scutage] would be that the tenant would make his payments not to substitutes, but to the crown." Mr. Round seems to underestimate the importance of this change; for the very essence of scutage is that it is a payment made directly to the king which enables him to dispense with the tenant's military service. Moreover, on pages 270-273, our author seemingly believes that scutage was a necessary corollary of all military tenures from the outset, but on page 533 he states that, when scutage first appears, it is peculiar to church fiefs.

In more than one place in this volume, the conviction is expressed that the Norman Conquest marks a distinct break or starting-point in English history, "that our consecutive political history does, in a sense, begin with the Norman Conquest," and that "the feudal element introduced at the Conquest had a greater influence on our national institutions than recent historians admit." It is interesting to notice the trend of

recent research backward toward the adoption of the "antiquated" views of writers like Selden and Spelman. We see this trend in Pike's *House of Lords*, in Vinogradoff's *Folkestone*, and, in a marked degree, in Round's *Feudal England*. There can be little doubt that Freeman unduly exalted the English element and minimized the results of the Norman Conquest. The present drift of investigation seems to be in the right direction, even if it is toward "antiquated" ideas.

CHARLES GROSS.

England under the Tudors. Vol. I. King Henry VII. (1485-1509).

By DR. WILHELM BUSCH, Professor of Modern History at the University of Freiburg in Baden. Translated under the supervision of the Rev. A. H. Johnson, M. A., by Alice M. Todd. With an Introduction and some Comments by James Gairdner. (London : A. D. Innes and Co. 1895. Pp. xiv, 445.)

THE various prefaces, introductions, and appendices make Professor Busch's work largely self-explanatory as to its sources, objects, and ideals. This volume is the first of six which are intended to cover the whole of the Tudor period, the first two volumes being devoted to the creation of the absolute monarchy by Henry VII. and Wolsey, the second two to the struggle of Henry VIII. with the Catholic Church and the immediate results of this quarrel, and the third section to the reign of Elizabeth. The work is distinctly a contribution to English history, in that it is based entirely upon a study of contemporary sources. From these the author constructs a picture of Henry VII. which is very different from that which has been most familiar. His avaricious tendencies, which play so large a part in older explanations of his policy, fall into insignificance. The cool calculations of the politician, patiently working out the problems prescribed by his difficult circumstances, rise into corresponding prominence.

The basis of Henry's policy is to be found in the effort, in the first place, to make good his position on the throne, and secondly, to elevate this royal power into a really absolute monarchy. To the first object tended all his complicated foreign relations. The pressure upon continental sovereigns to abstain from the support of pretenders to the English throne, the marriages and marriage treaties by which he obtained recognition among the older and more firmly seated dynasties, the strenuous efforts to maintain peace, so that his finances and internal administration might remain strong and regular, were all directed toward his security on a throne the right to which was, after all, but that of conquest. When this end was attained, his ambition for English prominence in European affairs was satisfied. Even Ireland was, with this view, treated in a strictly opportunist fashion, though part of his policy there was necessarily more creative. His moderate and prudent internal administration was instigated by the same necessity for guarding against deposition in the interest of some pretender, or as the outcome of a renewed civil war. In other internal affairs, how-